

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is a reply to the Final Office Action dated May 18, 2007.

Status of Claims

Claims 7, 11, 13 and 14 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12 have been canceled.

Amendments

In the specification, an obvious typographical/editorial error in the paragraph beginning at page 1, line 25 is corrected (*i.e.*, “loric acid” is -- lauric acid --). This amendment corrects an obvious error and one skilled in the art would not only recognize the existence of this error in the specification but also the appropriate correction needed.

Claims 7, 11, 13 and 14 are currently amended. Claims 7 and 14 have been amended to clarify that the film comprises a continuously extruded sheet containing *a polyolefin polymeric material* (e.g., page 6, line 15), and the wetting compound *consists of glycerol reacted with lauric acid* (e.g., page 1, lines 27-30; page 6, line 31; page 7, line 1), and a balance of the wetting agent comprises a *low density polyethylene* polymeric carrier resin with which the wetting compound and the titanium dioxide are blended (e.g., page 6, lines 15, 22), and *the film contains 0.2% to 3.0% by weight of the wetting compound* (e.g., page 6, lines 16-19; previous claim 12). Claim 11 has a minor amendment to correct its indicated dependency. Claim 14 has similar amendments as claim 7 and recites that the film contains about 0.2% to 1.8%, by weight, of the wetting compound (e.g., page 6, lines 16-19; claim 13 of record). Numerical ranges recited in claims 7, 11, 13 and 14 also have been revised consistent with suggestions made in the most recent office action.

Interview Summaries

The applicants’ acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of the telephonic interviews granted by the Examiner to the applicants’ undersigned representative on April 5, 2007 and June 15, 2007. No agreement was reached at that time as to the allowability of any particular claim. In the discussions of April 5, 2007, applicants’ representative indicated that the problem solved and other merits of the invention in detail, and pointed out that the applicants have experimental data in the specification showing unexpected results. The Jones reference of record was discussed. The Examiner’s position was understood to be that the claims lacked details on the recited

chemicals. The Examiner recommended that the applicants consider further amending the claims to be more specific with respect to the “wetting compound” and other wetting agent components. The possibility of the applicants’ presenting a draft supplemental amendment for additional consideration by and feedback from the Examiner prior to the Examiner’s next action also was discussed. In the interview of June 15, 2007, the Examiner was presented rheology data that applicants considered to show unexpected effects and results of the present invention. The Examiner was understood to indicate that the Jones reference of record remained relevant to the pending claims in view of the lack of details in the presently recited chemicals and amounts.

Claim Objections

Claims 7, 11 and 14 were objected to in view of several informalities set forth at page 2 of the most recent office action.

The applicants submit that the current amendments to claims 7, 11 and 14 are responsive to the objections made to these claims.

Obviousness Rejection

Claims 7 and 11-14 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,668,172). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Office Action refers to Example 4 of Jones et al. in support of this rejection. The applicants point out that Example 4 of Jones et al. recites the use of *amine acetate* in combination with titanium dioxide (col. 4, lines 61-71). Example 4 of Jones et al. is the only working example therein that illustrates titanium dioxide.

Present claims 7 and 14 recite, *inter alia*, a wetting compound consisting of glycerol reacted with lauric acid, and not amine acetate. As explained and demonstrated with evidence in the present application, extruded polymeric film materials made with a wetting agent consisting essentially of containing 10-13% wetting compound consisting of glycerol reacted with lauric acid and between about 38-44% titanium dioxide and a balance of low density polyethylene carrier, such that the film contains 0.2-3.0% of the wetting compound, have less holes/defects in the extruded polymer creating a unique product of a process. The above-identified unexpected and improved attributes of the presently claimed invention are quite surprising, and they would not have been predicted or expected from the teachings of Jones et al.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/001,363
Amendment submitted with RCE
Reply to Final Office Action dated May 18, 2007

In view of the significant differences between the teachings of Jones and the present claims, Jones et al. does not render the present claims *prima facie* obvious. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is respectfully requested.

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and notice of such is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that a teleconference would be useful in expediting the prosecution of this application, the official is kindly invited to contact Applicant's representative of record indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ramon R. Hoch/
Ramon R. Hoch, Reg. #34108

Date: August 31, 2007

Direct Correspondence To:
Customer Number 62753

Valerie Calloway, Esq.
Polymer Group, Inc.
9335 Harris Corners Parkway, Suite 300
Charlotte, North Carolina 28269
(704) 697-5177